



Research Paper

## Impact of Rural Development Programmes on the Citrus Fruit Growers in Himachal Pradesh

Dr. Vinod Kumar<sup>1</sup> Dr. Vivek kumar<sup>2</sup>

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Govt. College Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) India

2. Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Govt. College Indora, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) India

**ABSTRACT:** This paper examines the impact of rural development programmes on the citrus fruit growers in Himachal Pradesh. In rural economy of India, poverty alleviation, employment generation, social justice and infrastructural development have been the major areas of concern. With the passage of time govt. of India launched various scheme for the development of rural economy. Although a variety of development programmes, strategies, and initiatives have been implemented to promote the well-being of rural people but the issue of rural development remains unsolved. In the present study the total amount of subsidy received, assistance received in various scheme, the value of assets created out of this assistance, as well as the income and employment opportunities generated under the various Rural Programmes has been examined.

**KEY WORDS:** rural, citrus fruit growers, development, employment, scheme

Received 05 Apr, 2022; Revised 18 Apr, 2022; Accepted 20 Apr, 2022 © The author(s) 2022.

Published with open access at [www.questjournals.org](http://www.questjournals.org)

### I. INTRODUCTION

During last seven decades, various centrally and state sponsored rural housing schemes have been implemented through Rural Development Department. Indira Awas Yojna (IAY) was launched as an independent and major housing device on 1<sup>st</sup> January, 1996 to provide assistance for the construction and up-gradation of the dwelling units for the BPL rural households. The selection of beneficiaries is done by the Gram Sabha. This scheme is being implemented in the ratio of 75:25 between Government of India and state Government. In Himachal Pradesh, Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) was made effective from 2<sup>nd</sup> February, 2006 in Chamba and Sirmour districts, and covered all district up to 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2008. The objectives of this scheme are to provide livelihood security to the households in rural area of the state by ensuring 100 days generated employment in each financial year to every household.

### II. OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY

The current study's specific objectives are to evaluate the impact of rural development programmes on the levels of living and to suggest the measures for improving the levels of living among the citrus fruit growers in Himachal Pradesh. Because district Kangra has the highest concentration of citrus fruit growers in Himachal Pradesh, it was purposefully chosen to undertake the present empirical inquiry on the standards of living among the citrus fruit growers sample households. Kangra, Rait, Nagrota-Bagwan, Baijnath, Bhawarna, LambaGaon, Panchrukhi, Nurpur, Indora, Dehra, Nagrota-Surian, Pragpur, Fatepur, Sulah, and Dharamshala are the fifteen development blocks of Kangra district. Indora, Nurpur, Dehra, Kangra, Baijnath, Rait, and Pragpur are the eight blocks in district Kangra with the highest concentration of citrus fruit growers. A sample of 250 households was randomly selected from two development blocks out of the eight development blocks that are occupied by citrus fruit producers, using multi-stage random selection. 100 households fall into the category of marginal farmers, 70 households fall into the category of small farmers, 50 households fall into the category of medium farmers, and the remaining 30 households fall into the category of large farmers. The required information was obtained from the above 250 sample families with the goal of achieving the current study's goal.

### III. ANALYSIS AND RESULT:

The findings about the impact of rural development programmes on the citrus fruit growers in Himachal Pradesh are given below. The total amount of subsidy received, assistance received, the value of assets created out of this assistance, as well as the income and employment opportunities generated under the various Rural Programmes has been presented in Table 1. This table clearly indicates that the percentage share

of subsidy on fertilizer to the total amount of subsidy has been worked out 5.63, 6.87, 8.47 and 9.03 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 8.02. The percentage amount of subsidy on fertilizer shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holding. The percentage value of subsidy on fertilizers is the highest on the large holding groups mainly due to the reason that these farmers use more fertilizer as comparatively to small holdings.

**Table 1 Impact of Rural Development Programmes on the Distribution of Household Assets, Employment and Income**

S.N.	Items	Marginal Holdings	Small Holdings	Medium Holdings	Large Holdings	All Holdings
1	Subsidy (Rs.)					
	(I) Subsidy on Fertilizer	870.60 (5.63)	1784.06 (6.87)	3879.60 (8.47)	14268.13 (9.03)	3335.87 (8.02)
	(II) Subsidy on Vermin Compost	5000.00 (32.33)	6928.57 (26.69)	10660.00 (23.27)	26666.67 (16.87)	9272.00 (22.30)
	(III) Subsidy on Seeds	1070.00 (6.92)	1500.00 (5.78)	2500.00 (5.46)	5000.00 (3.16)	1948.00 (4.68)
	(IV) Subsidy on Pesticides	500.00 (3.23)	2157.14 (8.31)	4260.00 (9.30)	15866.67 (10.04)	3560.00 (8.56)
	(V) Subsidy on Spray Pump	250.00 (1.62)	294.29 (1.13)	300.00 (0.65)	328.33 (0.21)	281.80 (0.68)
	(VI) Subsidy on Plant	175.00 (1.13)	795.71 (3.07)	2522.00 (5.51)	30000.00 (18.98)	4397.20 (10.58)
	(VII) Subsidy on Poly houses	800.00 (5.17)	3142.86 (12.11)	7000.00 (15.28)	24666.67 (15.61)	5560.00 (13.37)
	(VIII) Subsidy on Irrigation Facilities	2020.00 (13.06)	4142.86 (15.96)	9600.00 (20.96)	35683.33 (22.58)	8170.00 (19.65)
	(IX) Subsidy on Grass Cutter	2045.00 (13.22)	2971.43 (11.45)	3000.00 (6.55)	3633.33 (2.30)	2686.00 (6.46)
	(X) Subsidy on Food-Items	2736.00 (17.69)	2240.00 (8.63)	2088.00 (4.56)	1920.00 (1.21)	2369.60 (5.70)
	Total Subsidy	15466.60 (100.00)	25956.91 (100.00)	45809.60 (100.00)	158033.13 (100.00)	41580.47 (100.00)
2	Assistance from Govt. for construction of Houses under various schemes					
	(I) Total Amount Received (Rs.)	3950.00 (100.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1580.00 (100.00)
	(II) Assets (value in Rs.)(house)	3950.00 (100.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1580.00 (100.00)
	(III) Income(Rs.)	3923.00 (43.72)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1569.20 (28.18)
	(IV) Employment (Mandays )	2.50 (4.72)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	1.00 (2.44)
3	Employment					
	(I) Employment in MANREGA (Mandays )	50.50 (95.28)	40.43 (100.00)	32.20 (100.00)	17.00 (100.00)	40.00 (97.56)
	(II) Income(Rs.)	5050.00	4042.86	3220.00	1700.00	4000.00

*Impact of Rural Development Programmes on the Citrus Fruit Growers in Himachal Pradesh*

		(56.28)	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)	(71.82)
4	Grand Total (2+3)					
	(I) Total Amount of loan(Rs.)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)
	(II) Assets (value in Rs.)	3950.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1580.00
		(100.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(0.00)	(100.00)
	(III) Income(Rs.)	8973.00	4042.86	3220.00	1700.00	5569.20
		(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)
	(IV) Employment (Mandays )	53.00	40.43	32.20	17.00	41.00
		(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)	(100.00)

Note:-Figures in parenthesis indicate percentages.

The percentage share of subsidy on Vermin Compost to the total amount of subsidy has been worked out 32.33, 26.69, 23.27 and 16.87 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 22.30. The percentage amount of subsidy on Vermin Compost shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holding.

The percentage share of subsidy on seeds to the total amount of subsidy has been worked out 6.92, 5.78, 5.46 and 3.16 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 4.68. The percentage amount of subsidy on seeds shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holding.

The percentage share of subsidy on pesticide to the total amount of subsidy has been worked out 3.23, 8.31, 9.30 and 10.04 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 8.56. The percentage amount of subsidy on pesticide shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holding.

The percentage share of subsidy on spray pump to the total amount of subsidy has been worked out 1.62, 1.13, 0.65 and 0.21 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 0.68. The percentage amount of subsidy on spray pump shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holding.

The percentage share of subsidy on plants to the total amount of subsidy has been worked out 1.13, 3.07, 5.51 and 18.98 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 10.58. The percentage amount of subsidy on plants shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holding.

The percentage share of subsidy on poly houses to the total amount of subsidy has been worked out 5.17, 12.11, 15.28 and 15.61 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 13.37. The percentage amount of subsidy on poly houses shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holding.

The percentage share of subsidy on irrigation facilities to the total amount of subsidy has been worked out 13.06, 15.96, 20.96 and 22.58 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 19.65. The percentage amount of subsidy on irrigation facilities shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holding.

The percentage share of subsidy on grass cutter to the total amount of subsidy has been worked out 13.22, 11.45, 6.55 and 2.30 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 6.46. The percentage amount of subsidy on grass cutter shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holding.

The percentage share of subsidy on food-items to the total amount of subsidy has been worked out 17.69, 8.63, 4.56 and 1.21 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 5.70. The percentage amount of subsidy on food-items shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holding. The percentage amount of subsidy on food-items is the highest on the marginal and small holdings group mainly due to the reason that Government provide food-items on subsidies rate to the BPL families and maximum BPL families belongs to marginal and small holdings group.

The per household share of assistance received from the Government for the construction of houses has been worked out Rs. 3950.00, Rs.0.00, Rs.0.00 and Rs. 0.00 on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this amount came out Rs. 1580.00. The percentage value of assets created out of this assistance to the total value of household assets under the Rural Development

Programmes has been worked out 100.00 per cent on the marginal size of holdings, whereas, among all the holdings together this percentage came out 100.00. The percentage increase in household income through assistance received from the Government for the construction of houses under Rural Development Programmes has been worked out to 43.72, 0.00, 0.00 and 0.00 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 28.18. The percentage of family human labour mandays utilization in gainful activities increased by 4.72, 0.00, 0.00 and 0.00 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 2.44. Thus, the percentage increase in the value of household assts, income and employment on the account of the assistance received from the Government for the construction of houses shows that under rural development programmes among the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings group the least better-off household benefited the most and the better-off benefited the least. It happened mainly due to the reason that the Government provides assistance for scheduled cast, scheduled tribe and BPL families for construction of houses under various schemes.

In the study area MANREGA plays an important role to provide employment opportunities to sample household. The percentage of family human labour mandays generated in MANREGA has been worked out 95.28, 100.00, 100.00 and 100.00 per cent on the marginal, small, medium and large size of holdings respectively. Among all the holdings together this percentage came out 97.56.

#### **IV. CONCLUSIONS, SUGGESTIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Thus, it can be concluded from the above empirical results that the percentage amount of subsidy on food-items shows a decreasing tendency with an increase in the size of holding. The percentage amount of subsidy on food-items is the highest on the marginal and small holdings group mainly due to the reason that Government provide food-items on subsidies rate to the BPL families and maximum BPL families belongs to marginal and small holdings group, whereas contrary to it, the percentage amount of subsidy on fertilizers shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holding. The percentage value of subsidy on fertilizers is the highest on the large holdings group mainly due to the reason that these farmers use more fertilizer as comparatively to small holdings. The percentage increase in the value of household assts, income and employment on the account of the assistance received from the Government for the construction of houses shows that under rural development programmes among the marginal, small, medium and large size of holding groups the least better-off household benefited the most and the better-off benefited the least. It happened mainly due to the reason that the Government provides assistance for scheduled cast, scheduled tribe and BPL families for construction of houses under various schemes. The percentage of assistance received from the government for old age pension, fee concession and fellowship received by the sample household shows an increasing tendency with an increase in the size of holdings. This clearly reveals that under the rural development programmes in case of employment scheme the poorest benefited the most and least poor benefited the least. Thus in the sample area, rural development programmes and employment scheme seems to have improved the socio-economic conditions of the poor rural households.

The Poverty Alleviation Programmes (except the self-employment scheme) have fallen short of their expectations in the rural areas of district Kangra, because the empirical results of the present study clearly established the fact that through these programmes the better-off benefited the most and least better-off benefited the least. About 68 per cent of the sample households have said that they are satisfied with the facilities provided from Gram Panchayats. Nearly 79 per cent of the sample household has got the representation in the co-operative societies. The rural households of Kangra district are very firms in their faiths and belief. About 60 per cent of rural households of Kangra district are superstitious. They believe that the blessings of God can remove mental illness, ailments, misfortune and natural calamities. Dowry system is prevalent among the rural households of Kangra district. About 35 per cent of the households favoured the dowry system, but dowry is never demanded and never insisted upon.

Therefore, in order to generate employment opportunities, household income and as well as to raise the socio-economic conditions of the poor rural households the planning strategy for rural development should be implement properly and more effectively in the rural area. The emphasis should be placed on the rural roads drinking water supply, general education, technical education, health and industrial sector.

#### **REFERENCES**

- [1]. Government of Himachal Pradesh, *Draft 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan 2012-17 and Annual Plan 2013-14*, Planning Department, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla, 2013, p.236.
- [2]. Government of Himachal Pradesh, *Draft 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan 2012-17 and Annual Plan 2013-14*, Planning Department, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla, 2013, pp.45-95.
- [3]. Government of Himachal Pradesh, *Draft 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan 2012-17 and Annual Plan 2013-14*, Planning Department, Himachal Pradesh, Shimla, 2013, pp.47-236.

- [4]. K.C. Sharma and Vibha Thakur, Disparities in the Distribution of Household Assets and Resultant Pattern of Employment and Income Among Gaddis of Himachal Pradesh, *PSE Economic Analyst*, Vol. XXV No. 2, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar, 2005, pp. 103-119.
- [5]. K.C. Sharma, Labour Utilization Pattern And Unemployment in Hilly Agrarian Economy of Himachal Pradesh, *Manpower Journal*, Vol. XLII, No. 4, Oct.-December, 2007, New Delhi, pp. 37-54.
- [6]. R. Radakrishna, Agricultural Growth, Employment and Poverty: A Policy Perspective, *Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 45, NO. 1, New Delhi, Jan. 2002, pp. 2-15.
- [7]. S.K. Bhanmik, Unemployment in India in the Post Liberalisation Era, *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 46, No. 1, Jan-March 2003, New Delhi, pp. 69-94.